

**To:** scott\_pruitt@fws.gov[scott\_pruitt@fws.gov]  
**From:** Melgin, Wendy  
**Sent:** Wed 4/19/2017 2:26:39 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Seven Hills update  
Seven Hills Briefing for AA power point v3.pptx

Scott, here is the update and the last powerpoint we have. I'm sure we will be updating it.

**From:** Schaller, Andrea  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2017 3:57 PM  
**To:** Landers, Timothy <Landers.Timothy@epa.gov>; Melgin, Wendy  
<melgin.wendy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Seven Hills update

Just a quick update in case questions arise when I am out Wednesday to Friday for military leave. Cause that is just what will happen.

HGM

I have not been able to completely review the HGM with the rest of my work load and controls. However, both George and I have concerns on the data collected. I have a call into Bill Ainslie about it and George has called his Corps HGM expert. The first thing that jumped out was the changes to export carbon which is at zero in the revised data. That implies that there is no connection to the downstream waters through either the wetland to Pigeon Creek or through channels. I know those streams were altered in the past but the levees and banks are beginning to slump and the streams onsite still connect to Pigeon Creek. George is planning on having that metric revised. So zero for that function is not the answer. There are other smaller points but that is the biggest issue.

We both noted that they moved a data point to show an area that best represents the plant community/cover type however they did not then capture that the previous area was converting to a forested wetland. Also there were no data points taken within the old stands along the western edge of the site. Undervaluing the site, the previous data used extrapolated values for other portions of the site. OR amount of acreage associated with each type of wetland they assessed this time around (functional HGM calculators are tied to area).

We are still waiting on base line HGM for proposed mitigation sites. Note I cannot say if it offsets impacts unless they also have plan on which functions they will improve.

EIS

Corps DE met with Peabody last week and said if EPA, FWS, and DNR all write letters that an EIS is not required then he may consider not requiring one (not that he would). Wait for the request for a letter

FWS site visits

I cannot thanks to military leave again in May, but FWS is heading out to look at possible mitigation sites for seven hills. Dates are May 4 and 5.

Will have my cell on me call if you need anything. Hopefully, all is quite till Monday....

**Andrea Schaller**

**USEPA-Region 5**

**77 W. Jackson Blvd, WW-16J**

**Chicago, IL 60604**

**[schaller.andrea@epa.gov](mailto:schaller.andrea@epa.gov)**

**312-886-0746**